

THE  
DEFENCE

Of sundry  
POSITIONS & SCRIPTURES  
FOR THE

Congregational-way  
JUSTIFIED:

OR

An Answer to an Epistle written by  
M<sup>r</sup>. Richard Hollingsworth, unto S. E. and T. T.  
wherein he (in many particulars) chargeth  
them with injurious dealing against God, and against  
himselfe, in that Booke of theirs, called  
*A Defence of sundry Positions, &c.*

CONTAINING

A Vindication from such Charges and aspersi-  
ons so laid upon them.

*As also a briefe Answer to his large (if not unrea-  
sonable) demands, to have Scripturall, or rati-  
onall Answer, given to his 112. Queries.*

By SAM. EATON Teacher of the Church at War-  
TICK TAYLOR Pastor of the Church at Chesham.

*Published according to Order.*

2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.

LONDON, Printed by Matthew Sturges, for Henry Durrant, and are to  
be sold at his Shop in the Strand, near the Church of St. Martin.

THE  
BEEFEN

OF THE  
POST OFFICE

COLLECTION

IN THE

YEAR

1800

AND

1801

BY

THE

POST OFFICE



## To the Seeker of *Truth* in *Sincerity*, DIRECTIONS.



CHRISTIAN BROTHER, *that lookest here-  
on, and art willing and desirous through Christ to  
search after and to receive the love of the Truth, that  
thou mayest be saved, and mayest further know and  
worship our God, and Father in Christ acceptably, in  
spirit and in truth, to glorifie his Name before men,  
wherein thou hast prophaned and polluted it, as we  
have done, by conforming (with the times) to the  
precepts and traditions of men: Ponder with us for thy direction  
these particulars.* 1. *That the Mystery of truth is not manifest to  
the World, the generality, but to the Saints, who are dead to the World,*  
John 14. 22. & 17. 6. Col. 1. 26. & 2. 20. & 3. 3. 2. *Hence this is  
found amongst them that are most full of love, Gal. 5. 6. John 13.  
35. He that dwells (or abides) in that love, abides in God, and God in  
him, 1 John 4. 16.* 3. *Hence it's amongst them that to others so doe, as  
they would be done unto, Mat. 7. 12. And that whatsoever they would  
not should be done to themselves, doe not it to others. (Act. 15. 20. 29.  
Old Transl. Margin. v. 20. Regius. v. 29. Complut. Regius in Naturali &  
Græc. vetust. & optimis, ait in sig. Selden De Anno Civile, c. 21. & De  
Jure Gent. li. 7. c. 12.)* 4. *It's amongst the pitifull. That yee seeke  
to the fatherlesse and widowes in their affliction, and keepe themselves  
unspotted from the world, John 1. 27.* 5. *This Wisdome is not from  
below, but from above, and is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, well-  
perswaded; (or rightly obedient) full of mercy Jam. 3. 17.* 6. *It's a-  
mongst such, as living godly in Christ Jesus, suffer persecution for his  
Names sake, 2 Tim. 3. 12. John 15. 19. & 16. 33. Mat. 5. 10, 11.*

*Now if thou hardly knowest such; Say to him whom thy soul loveth,  
O tell mee where thou feedest, where thou makest thy flocks lye down,  
Cant. 1. 7. and he will give true wisdome to thee, to discerns of per-  
sons, and things that differ.*

Yet expect not a Role without a pricke or spot. In many things we slip all. If any slip not in word, he is perfect, Jam. 3. 2. Expect therefore to finde this, amongst them, that in their generall aime and course, walke nearest according to that Rule, Gal. 6. 16. And be a doer of the will of God, as far as thou knowest. John 7. 17. and mainly be taken up with the knowledge, Grace, and love of Jesus Christ, that thy heart may be established therewith, Heb. 13. 8, 9.

For our parts, shame may cover our faces, that we have walked after as men: but henceforth our aime is so to walke as becometh the Gospel.

Cause it is of griefe to our soules, that there should be Oppositions between our Brethren and us, when the Canaanite (i. depressing Merchants) and the breach-making Perizite, are in the Land, Gen. 13. 7, 8.

The truth is, after long seeking our God, and oft discussing with our Brethren, we peaceably sit upon Reformation, Praëfising what we were convinced was most agreeable to the Word of God: Our Brother began against us: Printing against this our praëfise: Yet we forbore long, till we saw, that by our silence, not onely we, but Truth suffered; then were we forced to print Our just Defence of sundry Positions. And had he there staid, we had, now, abode silent, who by printing this, may each of us seeme a companion-wise, imprudent, (as Paul said oft of himselfe, being forced so to write in his owne, and the Truths Defence, 2. Cor. 12. 11. & 13.) And truly, had it been our persons onely that suffered, (though therein we share deeply) by this Late Printed Epistle, with certaine Queries (being for an Answer to our Defence;) we had in this kinde held our peace; (although our Brother could not easily repaire our Damage.) But seeing Truth now suffers a second time, by our so long forbearing, we are againe enforced to this seeming folly or imprudence. And by our viewing and pondering our Brothers angry bitter expressions, if we in any passage seeme to any, to have learned some of his wayes; (which we confesse we are subiect unto, Pro. 23. 25.) Let our weaknesse remaine with us, and not be charged on the Cause, or Truth that we maintaine. We are learning not to render evill for evill, or railing for railing, 1 Pet. 3. 9. and hope we shall more fully be taught of God therein.

Christian Reader, If thou hast read our Brothers Epistle, we intreat thee to have one care for this our Answer thereto: remembering what the wiseman said; He that is first in his owne cause, seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him, Prov. 18. 17. Consider what is said, and the Lord giveth thee and us, understanding in all things. 2 Tim. 3. 7. Amen.





THE  
D E F E N C E  
O F  
Sundry Positions and Scriptures, for  
the Congregational-way J U S T I F I E D :

*Reverend and beloved Brother,*



OU have saluted us with a querulous and Apologeticall Epistle; a querulous in reference to us, and Apologeticall in reference to your selfe; And with an 112 Queries, to all which you require us to give rationall and scripturall Answers; We will first take your Epistle into consideration, and afterwards debate what is meete to be said in reference to your Queries.

And first we will consider the justnesse of those charges that you lay upon us. Secondly, Whether you have acquitted your self from those charges you say are laid upon you.

The charges you make against us may be referred to seven heads. *Set. 1.*

1. That we unjustly charge you of provoking us to be your Antagonist in print. pag. 3.

2. That there is a difference betwixt our Title page and the text. pag. 8, 9.

A 2

3. That

The Congregational-way JUSTIFIED.

2. That our pretending to prove some positions, practices, by other Scriptures and arguments, as to your intent expressed in the preface, is a by-matter. pag 10.

3. That we do not answer directly, but obliquely, and evasively. pag 10. 11.

4. That we discover too much willingness to quarrell at your expressions. pag 11.

6. That contrary to rule and reason when we should make good the proofs of the Position from the Text alledged, we call to you to prove the contrary. pag 12

7. That we curtail and clip your answers, fold them up in obscure &c. Omit that which we know to be more pertinent, while we transcribe and largely answer some thing less pertinent. pag. 12.

1. To beginne with the first: How doe you acquit your selfe from provoking us to be your Antagonists in print? Did the Booke breake forth into the world against your consent? Your selfe imply the contrary, when you say others (rather then your selfe) thought fit the examination &c. should be printed. And what charge soever you gave concerning the prefixing of your name; yet we could not be ignorant what by R: H: M: A: of Maye. Col. Cambr. meant. Yer it was not your name (which we love as we doe your person) that could provoke us, but the matter in the Booke; which as it tended to the subversion of that Government which is in our apprehensions suitable to the golden rule of the word of God, and the setting up of another governmēt, which in the things in controversie we can see no other ground for, save humane policy and prudence, (so called,) measured by the line of naturall reason; so it reflected upon us in some particulars; which falling from us in conference or writing you took up, and committed your answer unto them to be made publique. And for that cause when we saw no other of better abilities take up the businessse, we thought we were bound to make our defence as publique.
- .e.8. pag publique.

*The Congregational-way* JUSTIFIED.

publique. But as Joseph in another case said to his Brethren, *Gen. 45. 5.* Be not grieved that ye sold mee, &c: so whether you provoked, or whether we without cause were provoked, yet if God (as we hope he will) make this a meanes to bolt out some truth of his, so farre forth we shall rejoyce in it.

Your second charge is, that there is a difference betwixt our Title page and the Text ( pag 7, 8.) for say you. *The Title speaks indefinitely, that the Positions and Scriptures alledged (not some or many of them) by me examined, are sufficient, pertinent and full of power, and are manifested, yea clearly manifested so to be. But in your text you disclaime the places applyed to Position 2 3, as it is by me controverted and are confident they are not found in the workes of any Congregationall man, &c.*

Ans<sup>r</sup> 1. The title page was not that we sent up, but was prefixed to our defence by a Friend, to whose care we committed it, to see to the printing of it, our selves living at such distance. And if lesse had beene given out in the Title, it would not have derogated from the validity of the worke, and would have liked us better. Notwithstanding we doubt not but to maintaine the concordance betwixt the Text and it, though not perhaps in every *Punctilio*. Yet it must be understood, that *so farre as the Positions and scriptures are ours, and truly and justly alledged by you as ours, so farre we maintaine the sufficiency and pertinency of them.* And also so farre as Congregationall men have intended to make use of them, in reference to their true and proper scope, in alledging them, they are full of power, for they have produced and mentioned severall of them as probable, and there is strength of probability though not of certainty, even in those texts in which the infallibility of them is not asserted.

2. The title that we sent up prefixed to our Booke, you may behold it in the first page of our defence without variation, and we suppose you will judge it modest enough.

3. And whatsoever may be said for the rest, yet sure we are, in the instance you give there is no difference betwixt them.

*The Congregational-way JUSTIFIED.*

them. For the Title page ingageth to a defence of sundry Positions, and scriptures alledged to justify the Congregationall way; But Position 23 as it is by you controverted, is a doctrine devised by your selfe, and the scriptures fixed by your selfe, to render us odious to all other Churches and all other Saints. As for us, we hate and detest the thought of confining the Priestly, Propheticall, and Kingly Offices of Christ, to Churches meere Congregationall; Neither were these scriptures ever alledged by us, or any of our judgement, (to our knowledge) to any such purpose: therefore without clashing with our Title page, we might and ought to explode them.

4. Forasmuch as your Title page runnes thus, *The examination of sundry scriptures alledged by our Brethren in defence of some particulars of their way*: Either make it out that some Brethren of the Congregationall way, have made use of these scriptures to this purpose, or else there will be found not onely an imaginary, but areall clashing betwixt your title page and your text, and you also will be found guilty the second time, of a grievous reproach, not onely against the Brethren, but against the way it selfe.

2. For the second place, viz. Position the 15, wherein say you, *After the allegation of some Authorities instead of answering a Text (upon which the distinction of Pastors and Teachers is grounded) You, (the one a Teacher and the other a Pastor) conclude, if we doe put a false glosse upon the scripture by misinterpreting of Eph. 4. 11. yet more modest language (let any man finde immodesty in that examination if he can) had become you Brother, seeing such reverend and learned men (whom your selfe honour) have gone before us in this exposition.*

Ans<sup>r</sup>. If we had only urged their authorities, you might have charged us with not making out in this place what we pretend in our title Page: but we urge and improve the reasons, and so make them our owne reasons, for the confutation of your answer. First, after we have shewed that whe-

ther

ther you translate the prepositive article *vs*, *some*, or *these*, you gaine nothing by it; we endeavour to prove that the Doctors are not Schoole-Doctors, but Church Doctors, from *Rom.* 12. 7, 8. *1 Cor.* 12. 8. and then proceed to prove that these Church Doctors are distinct from Church Pastors, not onely by the authority of *Zanchy*, but by the reasons rendred by *Pareus* and *Bucer*, and specified by us, viz. That God gives distinct gifts to Pastors from those that he gives to Teachers: For to the one is given a speciall faculty of exhortation, to the other a clearer understanding of doctrine, and consequently they are distinct offices; And yet you would make all men beleieve, that in our Reply, we defend not the Text at all.

Concerning our conclusion, in which immodest language is charged upon you, and your defence of your selfe (*Let any man finde immodesty in that examination if he can*) we say, we conceive not our selves injurious in it at all. For the immodest language, though it be not in the examination of this Position, yet we finde it in the first words of the preface which is applicable in your proper scope, to all the positions, and so consequently to this Position, viz. *True Positions and lawfull practises must not (much lesse untrue and unlawfull) be fathered upon God by misinterpretation of his word, &c.* In which words you doe insinuate the Positions which you examine, and practises built upon them to be untrue and unlawfull, and to be fathered on God by misinterpretation of Gods word. And therein you doe not asperse us onely, but lay an immodest charge upon *Bucer*, *Zanchy*, *Pareus*, who concurre with us in our Position and interpretation of *Eph.* 4.

Thirdly, say you, *Doe you clearly manifest that the text Mat. 18. (whatsoever other texts doe) doth prove that the Church must be Congregationall?*

*Answ.* We clearly manifest, what in conference we have endeavoured to prove out of these words, and the Position



as you have laid it downe and doe controvert it, we shall beleeve to be your owne Fiction, till you produce your Author. We hold that the exercise of Church Power by the Congregationall Church is founded upon this text, as the observation of the Christian Sabbath is upon the fourth Commandmēt. We have clearely proved that Christ in this place sends the offended Brother to the Church endowed with power at that time when the offence should be committed, and therefore sends the Brethren of the Jewish Church to the Jewish Church, whilst that Church remained in power: and sends the brethren of Christian Churches in the times of the Gospell to Congregationall Churches as they stand in opposition to Classicall, Provincially, Nationall and Oecumenicall Churches. And how slight soever you make of this our Reply, except by scripturall reasons, you force us to quit this ground, you lose your Presbyterian cause.

4

Fourthly, say you, *Position the 20. Have you clearely manifested that the Keys were given to Peter to be used by him, (For you could not but know that to be the meaning) as a Disciple, Beleever, not an Officer?*

*Ans.* We have clearely proved the contrary; And yet you without the least refutation of the prooffe made by us, stick to the conclusion, that we cannot but know the meaning to be, that the Keys were given to Peter to be used by him as a Disciple, or a Beleever, not as an Officer. A doctrine which we professe against (as in our Reply we manifest) as neither consonant to the mind of the holy Ghost, (as we conceive) nor the Elders of New England, whom you alledge, as we proved it out of the sense of their owne words. Doe we but sing to a deafe man in what we say to you? We leave it to the ingenious Reader to judge betwixt us.

5

Fifthly, say you, *Have you clearely manifested that Col. 4. 17. proves the Churches power to censure her Officers: when the strongest argument you bring, to prove Archippus his faultinesse, without which it was no censure, amounts but to a strong presumption and*  
*that*



that you know is but a weak proofe.

*Answ.* A man would imagine that you (Brother) never built any conclusions as morrally probable upon premisses that might beget strong presumptions, but that all your arguments were *demonstrationes potissimæ*, and concluded with an *Impetu Suo*, because you finde fault with our strong presumptions built upon two good reasons, and ushered in by the authority of *Zanchy*, as one of those many Classick Authors that assert the same thing with us in this particular. Yet your selfe upon this place argue thus. *Paul* (say you) bids *Timothy* fulfill his ministry, 2 *Tim.* 4, 5. yet this doth not suppose *Timothy* to be faulty, &c. And then you adde, And it may be *Archippus* was not faulty, and then this Admonition was no censure. and thence you inferre, therefore its alledged to no purpose; It had beene more tollerable if you had said therefore it may be, it is alledged to no purpose. Is it a fault in us to build a strong presumption upon two reasons, yet uncontrowled? Is it no fault in you (Sir) to build a peremptory conclusion upon that which amounts to no more then an *it may be*, which is not so much as a remote probability, much lesse a strong presumption?

Examination in  
pag. 15, 16.

Since our worke and businesse was to defend the scriptures alledged against your examinations, we have fulfilled what our Title page undertakes, if we prove that a Church hath a priviledge to admonish her Officers by virtue of this text, any thing in your examinations notwithstanding. Now the two reasons by us alledged make it absolutely cleare, that *Archippus* was faulty by virtue of *Col.* 4. 17. and that the Churches power in censuring her Officers, may be, and is founded hereupon. i. e. For ought you alledge to the contrary in that place, and containe in them grounds of a strong presumption that the thing is so indeede.

Sixtly, Have you (say you) clearely manifested from *Adams Family*, that 7 8 or 9, make a Church, &c.

*Answ.* Is not our worke to defend the Position against your

your arguments? Is there any thing that hath the least appearance of an argument produced by you in this section, which we have not fully answered? If there be, produce it.

We thought it superfluous and impertinent to prove that which your selfe clearly grant, when you say the case of *Adam* and *Noah* was extraordinary, there were no more in the world, and therefore could be no more in the Church: Doe you not grant a Church at that time consisting of 7, 8 or 9, Of this we make use, and argue in effect thus; How few ever made a Church since the beginning of the world, the same may make a Church at this day: But 7, 8 or 9 (say you) made a Church in *Adams* time and *Noahs* time, Therefore 7 8 or 9, may make a Church at this day. Yet we would not have the Church to consist of no more, but judge a numerous addition of members a great mercy.

As for our concession (*that God hath not precisely determined what number doth make a Church*) which you make use of to darken the cleareness of our manifestation, we say, It is a confirmation of our argument which we bring, viz. *That looke how few have made a Church, so few may make a Church still, because God hath not determined what number a Church must consist of.* And it is brought to cleare the Position that 7 8 or 9, may now make a Church, because so many have made a Church in *Adams* and *Noahs* dayes. And till you have overthrowne the strength of the Argument which is contained in these words (*because God hath not determined what number must make a Church*) you deale not candidly, to suggest that our owne acknowledgement in those words, is against that cleare manifestation of that Position, which we in the Title page speake of.

Sevently, *He thinks you have not cleared* (say you) *that Revel. 8. 8, 9. is sufficient and full of power against sessed Endowments.*

*Ans.* Sir, It falls out with the best writers, as it doth with the best builders, they have not onely in the making of their

their walles certaine peeces of timber, which beare up the weight of the stories and rooffe which if they were removed the whole buildnig would fall; but also certaine carved enterteifes, which serve for ornament; and yet possibly may yeeld some contributions of strength also; yet so, that if they should be removed; the building would remaine firme. These amongst the learned are usually types, doubtfull parables, and darke propheties, which they bring in when they have solidly proved a point by sound argument before. Thus it falls out with the Elders of New England, who being demanded whether they did allow or thinke fit to allow and settle any certaine stinted maintenance upon the Ministers, answer that there is nothing done that way amongst them, and their practise they defend by two reasons, which must needs inferre the unfitnessse of the contrary course at least to them which may be resolved into these two Arguments.

1. Arg<sup>t</sup> If the Condition of the Ministers and the Churches to which they belong may vary, then it is unfit to settle a certaine and stinted maintenance for the Ministry: But &c. *Ergo.*

2. Arg<sup>t</sup> If Christ our Lord hath appointed no such thing as stinted maintenance, then it is unfit for the Church to settle stinted maintenance: But &c. *Ergo.*

Upon these two pillars is the fabrike of their practise borne up; yet to adde some probable lustre to what was well proved before, they adde the opinion of some Divines concerning Revel. 8: 8, 9. and they speake doubtfully of the place, as not thinking it fit confidently to lay this burden upon it; But say they, if those writers be not deceived, which so expound that scripture, as for our parts we know not but they expound it truly, &c. They say not confidently that the exposition is true, but that they know not the contrary; and if so be so, then it may be truly gathered, that the bringing in of seculer endowments and eminent preferments into the Church hath bene the corruption and to some the destruction of

such as lived by them, both Church Officers and members. And we have endeavoured to shew the probability of this interpretation, but dare not speake definitively of it. Yet the Position in the letter of it undertakes no more than what you (Brother) grant, viz. that *Revel. 8. 8, 9.* is applied by some good Authors to those times in which *Constantine* brought settled endowments into the Church, and yet we are still beaten as though what the Elders intended (*viz.* to cast a probable lustre upon what was solidly proved before) we had not clearly delivered this text of scripture, and by consequence must be guilty of belying God, and counterfeiting the King of Kings hand, which is the language of the preface, and so make us a laughing stock to some, and the objects of hatred to other vulgar readers; For this cause we must of necessity discover your dealing in this business.

Deut. 25.  
18.

2. It is said of *Amaleck* that he met *Israel* in the way, and *smot the hindermost of them, even all that were feeble behind them*: so you (Brother) shew a singular dexterity in passing by the two fore-mentioned reasons, and fall upon the probable argument drawne from this place, the hindermost and most feeble of all the rest.

3. Again, what they speake *hypothetically*, and by way of supposition, you make use of *thetically*, and by way of position, and so, that it may well leave the ordinary reader under this apprehension, that we have no other argument to build our dislike of stinted Church maintenance upon, but this place. For your scope is apparently not onely to vindicate the scriptures from abuse, but also to confute these positions of the Congregationall way.

4. Once more, whereas the Elders shew that this place is applied to those times wherein *Constantine* brought settled endowments into the Church with *ampla pradia large possessions*; you (Brother) leave out *ampla pradia*, and mention onely *settled maintenance*, whereas the place may be understood in the latter sense, as well as in the former. For there  
were.

*The Congregational-way JUSTIFIED.*

11

were certaine Revenues belonging to the Churches before *Constantine* his time, as may appeare out of the imperiall constitution, directed to *Anilinw*, wherein he saith, We have already decreed the same, that the possessions belonging to the Churches aforetime, should be restored; And againe provide, that if either gardens or houses, or other possessions whatsoever have belonged to the tytle of their Churches, all the same be speedily restored to them againe.

*Euseb. lib.  
10. 1. 5.*

Lastly, Give us leave to tell you, that we conceive you are not a little injurious to the *Elders of New-England*, and learned Master *Forbes* and others, whilest you affirme that *Constantines* donation (as you seeme to understand it) is the foundation of this exposition; because you would imply, that they beleeve such a donation of *Constantine* to be a truth, which is such an impudent fiction, that all wise men no sooner heare it, but abhorre it. For those which say least, affirme that *Constantine* gave the City of *Rome* to *Silvester* the Pope and his successours, and others are not ashamed to avouch that he gave all the *Westerne Empire*. And this donation is mentioned by *Gratian* in the *Decretalls*, this also is censured by *Nauclerus* to be but *Palea*, because it is manifest that *Constantine* gave *Italy* and other Kingdomes of the *West* to his sonnes by his last will and testament. Now not of this *Donation* but of other maintenance which *Constantine* bestowed; not upon the Bishop of *Rome* alone, but upon other godly Bishops and Ministers throughout his Empire, are the *Elders of New-England* Master *Forbes* and others to be understood.

*d. c. fund.  
de Elic.  
Sext. Chro.  
vol. 2.*

Eighty say you, And *Position 7* doe you manifestly cleare that *2 Cor, 8, 5.* doth pertinently and powerfully prove, that every member at his admission doth promise to give himselfe to the Church to be guided by them, when you say, the practise of the Churches of *Macedonia* is by way of allusion made use of, and the Argument is a Comparatis. For you know allusions and comparisons are not argumentative.

*Answ.*



*Anſw.* Why doe you the second time after admonition given by us in our former booke leave out that, without which neither can the Churches directing, nor the members following direction be lawfull. For the Elders of New-England say not that a Church member is to give him selfe up to the Church to be guided by her according to will, but according to God; But these words (according to God) you leave out.

2. If to answer all your *Reasons* to the contrary be to defend this *Position* by vertue of this text, we have done it; produce (if you can) any thing which hath the least appearance of an Argument in it, which we have not answered.

3. We have shewed that the case of the *Macedonian Churches*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 5. is parallell with the case of a member giving him selfe up to be guided by the Church according to God: For as God gave *Paul* and *Timothy* to direct the Churches of *Macedonia* according to God, so God hath given particular Churches to direct their severall members according to God, that is to say, The Elders, by way of office authoritatively, and the brethren as God shall give them opportunity to advise and admonish their fellow members. Therefore by the same reason that the Churches of *Macedonia*, gave themselves up to *Paul* and *Timothy*, by the same reason ought Church members to give up themselves to the Church to be directed by her according to God.

But you would make men (at least if any possibly may looke upon this exception, as though Logique Reason, and Religion what ever they be are wholly insubservient to your present designe) beleieve (whether you have confuted us or no) that we have confuted our selves, when we say, it is *Argumentum a comparatis*; for say you, *You know that allusions and comparisons are not argumentative.*

For unlesse we must unknow all that we have knowne to gratifie your cause withall, we must needes professe that when we were but boyes in the University, we were taught that one head or common place from which Arguments were



were to be drawne was a *Comparatus* from Comparisons. And we have had no reason to extirminate that doctrine from intermeddling with the matters of God. Suppose a man should say to Master Hollinworth (a Minister) You should season others with the salt of knowledge, and of the love and feare of God, for you are the salt of the earth, *Math. 5. 13.* You should feede your people with wholesome doctrine and discipline, for you are a shepheard, would Master Hollinworth out with this Logique, and say Comparisons prove nothing and therefore the Arguments are naught? Did Paul commit a *Solerisme* in Logique when he proves that Ministers should receive maintenance because the mouth of the Ox must not be muzzleed, that treadeth out the corne? Or is our Saviours argument weake and insufficient, when he justifieth his Disciples for plucking the eares of corne, by an argument a *Comparatis* taken from Davids taking and eating the shew-bread? So that, till we have something more then your bare assertion to convince us, we shall beleieve there is a truth in the old rule of *Analogie, Quod de uno, secundum proportionem affirmatur vel negatur, id etiam de altero: That which is asserted or denied of one thing, according to proportion may be asserted or denied of another thing.* And if you can overthrow this old maxime, we are confident that the *Classique* cause will suffer as well as the Congregational hall.

Ninthly, say you, In stead of cleare manifestation of Ministers maintenance out of the Stock of the Church, you say, we thinke we see most warrant for it from the New Testament, and as most probable once disputed it, but neither then nor now are peremptory in it, &c.

Ans. What shall our modesty be now made use of against us? Though it be so, yet we shall desire to be modest still. It was the Commentation of *Agur*, that he did *plurimum facere & minimum de se loqui*; We hope God will never leave us so farre to our selves as to professe any doctrine, or fall upon any practise confidently and peremptorily.

*Salust. del. Jug.*

torily as of divine inspiration or institution, for which we have not a *cleare* evidence of scripture; That rythes and stinted Church maintenance are unlawfull, that Ministers are to be maintained out of the Church stocke, the reception and distribution whereof appertaineth to the Deacons office, we conceive we have solidly proved out of the word of God: But that the Ministers are to be maintained by such a stocke as is raised by a *weekly contribution*, because it is not *absolutely* cleare in the Text (at least to us) we thought fit to dispute it onely as *probable*. If you could come as neare unto a demonstration of *Classique* government, as this chapter doth to a demonstration of a stocke by weekly contribution of the Church, and we had no more to say against it, then yet we have heard (for we cannot prophesie what you may hereafter produce, against a Stocke raised by weekly contributions, we should be tender how we mutter'd a word against *Classique* government.

2. Except you can produce some one of the *Congregational* way, that in writing or disputation hath asserted weekly contributions to be of divine institution, and binding to all Churches, we shall esteeme the *Position* and scripture annexed (as to such a purpose) your owne invention. As for us as we defended it in disputation, so we have to the same purpose clearely manifested it to be sufficient, pertinent, and full of power, viz. to make it *probable*, that the Ministry should be maintained by a Stock raised by weekly contributions, and see no cause to doubt, but that we have solidly answered all your arguments to the contrary.

Lastly, *Colophonis vice*, as the close of this charge, you conclude when you say, *we thinke we conceive its probable, and doe never so confidently assert any of the severall Positions, and doe not prove the same by the severall texts respectively alleadged, nor cleare the said text from all Objections made against your Exposition (one materiall Objection unanswered being enough to invalidate the same) you afford so many Arguments to any wise Reader,*

Reader, that you have not clearly manifested the Positions and Scriptures where such Speeches are found to be sufficient, &c.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. All that we have to say is this, First, That your triumph concerning our not proving the Positions by the Text respectively alleadged is before your victory. Secondly, Though one materiall Objection unanswered (unanswerable you should say, for our weakenesse may not (peradventure) be able to defend a truth) doth invalidate our Exposition: yet where we urge divers Texts to any Position, if any one of them be truly urged, and so unanswerable, though you should invalidate all the rest as to such a purpose, you may advantage the truth thereby, but advantage not your cause at all. So that one materiall Objection (such as we have not yet met with in your writings) though it might invalidate the Exposition, yet possibly might not prejudice the Position at all.

The third Charge which you lay upon us, that our pretending to prove some Positions and practises by other Scriptures and Arguments (as to your intent expressed in the preface) is but a By-matter, For Positions and practises may be true and lawfull, and yet not truly and lawfully grounded on the Text alleadged, &c.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. When the King had burnt *Jeremiahs* Rowle, and and he caused *Baruch* to write the Rowle a new, it is said, he <sup>*Jerem. 36.*</sup> added besides to them many like words. If we had neglected to answer your Examination of the Scriptures alleadged by us, and had fallen upon new scriptures, you might well have complained: but we thought good measure pressed downe shaken together and running over, would not have offended you. And yet the truth is, we know not how to please you, the one way or the other. In some sections (though to our understanding) we have not left any thing in the similitude of an Argument unanswered yet) we are complained of, that we have not clearly manifested the Position, as we have already shewed. And how should this be done otherwise than by

answering your *Examination*, unless it be by new *Arguments*: And what are *Arguments* worth, if not backed with *scriptures*? and yet when besides our answer to your examination, we adde some short dissertation upon the Point, this is counted as a *By-matter* to your *intent* in the preface.

2. Your *intent* as it appeares both in your *Title Page*, the *Preface* and the *Booke* it selfe, was not onely to vindicate the *scriptures*, but to discover the supposed weaknesse of the *doctrine* contained in the *Positions*. And why should not we as well assert the *doctrine*, as vindicate the *scriptures*, which (some of them cull'd out by you) are the weakest and most feeble parts of the prooffe made by us as we have told you

3. You could wish you say, *we might keepe close to the Scriptures and Positions alleadged, till they be one way or other cleared, and then we may more orderly proceede to other scriptures and arguments*: and yet you that cannot endure any addition of scripture or reason applyed to the question stated more fully to our owne sense, than they are in the *Positions* drawn up by you, require us in the meane time to give scripturall and rationall answers to no lesse then an hundred and twelve *Queres*, whereof some of them are *Nihil ad Rhombum* independants (we are assured) in the businesse of controversie betwixt us.

The fourth Charge that you make against us, is, *That we doe not answer directly, but obliquely and evadingly in sundry places, as where (say you) I alledge that the Apostles never taught or practised to gather or separate one part of this true Church, and another part of that, especially persons whom themselves converted not, to make a purer Church. You answer of another thing which was never denied, viz. The Apostles both taught and practised the separating of some Jewes from other Jewes and gathered them into a Christian Church, while yet the Jewish Church was not dissolved, but was a Church of God.*

*Ans.* We are so farre from answering obliquely or evadingly in this place, that we dare be bold to say, that no reply

ply can more *front* and *diametrically* oppose such a confused answer as yours is, then this of ours doth. We did observe that the supposed *Strength* of your answer, was couched in the *four sinewes* of it. 1. We thought you deserted it as a thing dissonant to the doctrine and practise of the *Apostles*, to gather some Christians from others to make a purer Church. 2. We conceived that the truth of the Churches from which persons are gathered, was that which you imagined, made the gathering of them in such sort to beare no conformity with the *Apostles* doctrine or practise; And we conceived there was this implication in it, that it might be lawfull and suteable to the doctrine and practise of the *Apostles*, to gather beleivers out of a *false* Church, but not out of a *true*. 3. We considered that this might have some strength in your thoughts, that there is no such thing mentioned in the doctrine and practise of the *Apostles* as the gathering of *one Church* out of *many*. 4. That you imagined that there was some strength in it to prove *our gathering* of Churches unlawfull, because the persons gathered were such as we *converted not*. Having thus *anatomized* in our thoughts your Answer, we addressed our selves to discover the weaknesse and falliblenesse of all these *Exceptions*, and we began with the *second*, because it was most *generall*; and so descended to the rest which were more *particular*. And *First*, we shewed, that the *truth* of a Church is not that that can make it sinfull or *unlawfull* to gather or take in the members of it into the union of *other* Churches; For then it should have beene unlawfull for the *Primitive* Churches to have gathered in the beleiving *Jewes* into their Churches whilest that Church remained *true*; But this say we was the doctrine and practise of the *Apostles*. Now what can be more *point blank* opposite to this part of your answer then this? Hence also our conclusion hath the strength of this argument in it, If it be not *unlawfull* to withdraw from *one Church* that is *true*, then it is not *unlawfull* to gather out of



twenty or an hundred, i. e. because they are true.

*Object.* But (say you) *this was not a Christian Church.*

*Ans.* We consider it not as Jewish, but under the notion of truth, as it was a true Church.

*Object.* Nor are the Reformed Churches and Ministers to be compared with the then Jewish Church and Priests thereof.

*Ans.* You shuffle in the Ministers of the one, and the Priests of the other impertinently: We have onely to doe with the Churches, and we say the Christian Churches might be compared with the then Jewish Church under the notion we consider it in, viz. in point of truth; For the Jewish Church was a true Church as well as the Christian Churches.

*Object.* It was but one (say you; and you should shew gathering out of severall Churches.

*Ans.* Doe we not shew it thus? If it be lawfull to gather out of one true Church, then it is lawfull (upon the same ground) to gather out of many.

*Object.* But (say you) the Apostles gathering was onely of those Jewes they converted to Christianity from unconverted Jewes, and you should shew the gathering of Christians converted by others, from other Christians.

*Ans.* This also we have shewed at large, clearing also the former objection together with it by severall arguments and two places of scripture, viz. 1 Cor. 5, 6. 2 Cor. 13, 10. In our second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth particulars, and these in opposition to the first and third particulars wherein we thought you placed the strength of your answer.

*Object.* But you should shew the gathering of Christians converted by others from other Christians converted as well as they, and possibly from those persons by whom they were converted.

*Ans.* And this we have fully cleared, pag. 10. from the practise of the Apostles and Primitive Christians.

None but an Emperick would censure a Physician that he doth not cure all diseases with one Dosse. Shall our reply be judged



judged oblique, evading, & insufficient, because it is not a bush to stop every gap with, though it be most punctually opposite to that part of your answer, against which we levelled it.

*Objec.* But (say you) that Church was then by Gods Commandement to be dissolved, and many Churches to be built upon its ruins, and therefore doth no more warrant the building of one Christian Church upon the ruine of other Christian Churches, than the Parliaments Commission (if there were such a one) to the Inhabitants of Derby hundred, to take downe Latham house to build them houses of, doth warrant any one of the Inhabitants to take as many good stones as they can come by, out of this, and that, and the other neighbours house, concerning which they gave no such Command.

*Ans.* You lately found fault with an argument of ours, because it was a *Comparatis*, alleading that allusions and Comparisons are not *argumentative*, if allusions and Comparisons were not capable of a better *symmetrie* and proportion then this of yours, we should not onely not yeeld them to be *argumentative*, but we should disavow and discard them as not *illustrative*. For though it was not our intent (as we said) to answer all the branches of your objections, with this one instance, but onely that that deceives its strength from the *truth* of Churches (and therefore your triumph out-running your victory, might well have been spared, when you say, your not bringing a more punctuall and more pertinent prooffe, argues either an *implicite confession* of the truth of my answer, or inability to oppose it) and though we have brought other punctuall and pertinent proofes which are above the reach of your instance, yet though all were as you would beare the world in hand, your *Allegorie* wants that due proportion that should render it *illustrative*, much more *argumentative*.

For First, it is not the practise of Congregationall members, or Churches, to take any, much lesse as many good members as they can come by out of this, and that, and the other

*The Congregational way* JUSTIFIED.

other neighbouring Churches, concerning which, God hath given no Command that those persons should leave those Churches. For so your comparison should be framed to make it runne *parallell* with the case. Nay the *Congregationall* members make it their scope to take in none but those, that having righteously withdrawne themselves from other Churches, doe voluntarily tender themselves to communion with them, that so they may enjoy those Ordinances purely with the corruption of which they were not onely polluted, but endangered before; And that they may enjoy other Ordinances *purchased* for their *speciall* edification by the precious *bloud* of Christ, which their soules languished in the want of, whilest they were (some of them) as members in the line of *Parochiall-Communication*. Once more, it is the scope and end of *Congregationall* members, and Churches (if we understand them aright) sure we are, it is our owne desire and practise, to receive in no members, but from such Churches, in which we have no ground of hope in sight, for a *reformation* in any tollerable proportion of time, all of us having expressed the offence given us by *Parochiall* disorders to *private* brethren, because it would have beene interpreted a disturbance of the Churches peace, for private persons to speake *publicly* against the received practise of the Church; And some of us who by our calling were better enabled, having not onely in vaine witnessed against the Leaven, with which we saw the Churches leavened, but also fruitlessly waited a long time for redresse of present greivances, when there was no hope left, have withdrawne.

3. If God by meanes of this present happy *Parliament*, (wherein next under God is our present hope) or by other should worke *such* a reformation, that we might comfortably joyne with Churches meeting neerer to our habitations then our owne, we should be willing for our parts (and we beleeve the same of all our brethren) to lay downe by  
mutuall

mutuall consent our *Covenant*, and fall into fellowship in severall other Churches, especially where we were sometimes members respectively.

4. It supposeth the Churches from which our members have withdrawne, have as good right to hold their members as well as any man in *Derby* hundred hath to withhold the stones of his house from those that without a just power endeavour to take them away; which how you will make out, seeing that you hold no other tie, but the boundaries and limits of the *Parish* or *Chapelry*; do so fervently dispute against expresse agreements and *Covenants* we understand not. Yet if the waies and walking of *Parish* Churches were such as tended to the edification of the members, and no just cause appeare of their removall or withdrawing, we should not contest with you about it. But if either visible wicked members be admitted to the *Lords Supper* without hope of redresse, or the dispensation of the *Lords Supper*, and execution of the power of the *Keys*, and other *Ordinances* be wanting, without hope of redresse, we conceive they have no more power to withhold such a member from joyning to another Church for his spirituall better accommodation, than a *Master* hath to withhold his *Servant* from removing to another *Family*, that so he may not be enfeebled by being straitned in his food, or endangered by the unwholsomenesse thereof.

5. Fifthly, But it may be there may be some more ground for your *sift charge*, which is, *That we discover too much willingness to quarrell at your expressions: a little after (say you) you discover too much willingness to quarrell at my expressions, wherein you say I would suggest, that you make opposition to Magistracy: but doth not Master Weld a Congregationall man, when Master Rathband chargeth Independents to hold, that Christians may and ought to set up new Churches and practise in them all Gods Ordinances without the consent of a Christian State, you against their peremptory Commands and established laws,*

lawes; and in the midst and against the minde of such Churches, as they freely acknowledg to be the true Churches of God, say of this Article, no pen can expresse a greater latitude of opposition against Magistracy and Lawes, and Churches too; then he affirms to be in us? Doe not I use his owne words? Print them in a different Character? Cite them in the Margent? &c.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. True, you do so; notwithstanding it was not discerned by us, and the fault was most in your selfe; For you print it in a different Character, and cite Master *weld* in the Margent, but were defective in a letter to guide to the citation: and hence the mistake: For you cite *Answer to 9 pos. pag. 76.* as appertaining to the letter (*u*) speaking of something that was proper to *Apostolick* men, and then immediately joyned *T. W.* to *W. R.* pag. 67. by close to it, without any other letter, as if it had belonged to the same thing; and so we received of it, as you may discern by our defence, when we make any mention of that part of your answer, which speaks of the Apostles preaching against the peremptory Command of *Magistrates*, we print your Citation pointed at by the letter (*b*) and we annexe *T. W.* to *W. R.* pag. 67. to it, as appertaining to the same thing. The truth is, we were faulty also, because if we could have looked into that place of Master *welds* booke, we might have rectified our selves in that mistake. But that Booke was out of our way, when we should have done it, and afterwards we did not minde it. And as for the different Character, we minded it lesse, because for many causes the Character is changed, besides that when other mens words are cited. Had we beene aware that they were Master *welds* words, we would have gave given a more pertinent answer, which hereafter if there shall be occasion we shall annexe.

And whereas you say, *this is but one example of many*, as we know none at all, so if there be any of moment, we perswade our selves we should have met with them under this charge, for you spare not to give many instances of the same

same kinde, when you apprehend it makes for your advantage.

6. The sixth charge undertakes to prove that we have a faculty, and make much use of it to turne the prooffe over to you. When I shew you (say you) where the prooffe of the Position, from the text alledged is defective, and require you to supply that defect, you then turne it over to me to prove the contrary, as 1 Cor. 16. 1. When I say the Churches of Galatia might for ought you alledge to the contrary, be combined one to another, the substance of your answer is, without prooffe we cannot grant it; And that you may more plausibly put the businesse off your selves, you leave out the words (for ought you alledge to the contrary).

Ans<sup>r</sup>. A little before we were told that to prove some positions by other scriptures and arguments than those annexed to the Positions (as to your intent in the preface) was a *by matter*; And it was wished that we might keepe close to those scriptures and positions till they were cleared, but in this place though we answer your arguments, and consequently make good the proofes annexed, and when we have done, tell you that without prooffe we cannot grant such a *Classicall* Combination in *Galatia*, as is in *scotland*, and in *Holland*, yet we are arraigned as departing from rule and reason, because we turne the probative part over unto you. Is not our part *defensive* onely of these Positions and scriptures? And if we deliver the scriptures of the doctrine contained in the Positions, any thing in your examinations contained notwithstanding, we doe *Spartam quam nacti sumus ornare*, Performe what we have undertaken. And though when we doe more, (if solidly and truely) your selfe and all the lovers of truth are so much the more our debtors, yet if we doe thus much onely, you have no cause to censure us.

2. As for you, Forasmuch as you afford such hard quarter to the Positions as to make them by interpretation a *helping of God, counterfeiting of the King of Kings hand, and an*  
D
addition



addition to his word, (since he that makes a charge must prove it) we thought you were bound (these arguments in your examination failing) either to make out your charge by other arguments, or at least confesse, that you have wronged the Authors of such Positions and the truth it selfe, and therefore we put you upon prooffe.

3. As we put nothing off our selves that belonged to us, so we never left out those words, (*for ought you alledge to the contrary*) for any such end as you suggest. But for brevity sake, and because we thought there was nothing materiall to the businesse in hand, either for your advantage, or our disadvantage contained in them. For though if you understand it in a sense nothing to the purpose, viz. *The Churches of Galatia might be combined, for ought we alledge to the contrary*; meaning God could have combined them, so he could have made Rome, Paris, or Madrid, the place of an Oecumenicall Congregation, for worship and government; It is true: yet if you meane the Churches of Galatia might be combined, for ought we alledge to the contrary, meaning there is nothing in the prooffe made in the Position that inferres the non-combination of the Churches of Galatia: we say, it is your oversight to assert it. And we turne not over the prooffe to you, but having confuted the supposed prooffe to the contrary, vve send you to seeke new arguments, or yeeld us the cause.

7. The last charge, is of a great wrong to your selfe, and the truth of God, (as you say) viz. *That we curtall and clip your answers and arguments, not onely the supplement, but the substance and strength of them, folding them up in obscure, &c. sometimes omitting them with a Censure*; You aske us a little after, *Doe you not omit that which you know to be pertinent, while you transcribe and largely answer something lesse pertinent?*

Ans. What may be done through oversight vve know not, but vve have omitted nothing pertinent of purpose or advisedly; *Dolus latet in generalibus*, your ten generall charges



ges we cannot but take to be great injuries, and the issues of a spirit of *detraction*, since you would beare the world in hand, that they are so many; that they would too much enlarge this Epistle, augmenting it in sundry pages; If you had spared your *Queries* at this time, and left roome for the discovery of these supposed *uncandide* passages, you had done your selfe no lesse right, and us much lesse wrong; And if you had but barely cited the pages and lines your where such passages are found, would this have swell'd up Epistle to many pages more?

But let us consider the *instance* you give, and leave the Reader to guesse at the rest, for its more then probable, you would single out the grossest you could finde.

And first, concerning the omitting of the seven particulars, in *position* 24. Which you plainly affirme we left out, *least the Reader had we transcribed them should have expected an answer*. We rendred another reason (which we have the cleare testimony of our consciences for, was the true reason why we left them out) and that which you obtend no reason at all) yet as though you did communicate with God, in his incommunicable excellency of being *omniscient* the searcher of the heart, you affirme, that *therefore we left them out, least the Reader (had we transcribed them) should have expected an answer*. We say againe, if we give you for granted those seven particulars, (or rather seven generall heads, including in them many particulars) improve you them to the best advantage of your *Presbyterian* cause, in *opposition* to the doctrine included in the 24 *position*. For those particulars how many (soever they be, are no parts of the discipline left by Christ to the Church, which (the *position* saith) in the essentials of it is unchangeable, and therefore the *position* may be defended, though those particulars be granted. And for this cause we shall desire to be excused with you, and nothing feare, incurring prejudice with the Reader, though we did not transcribe your seven tedious *impertinencies* to the cause in hand. D 2

2. We

2. We say further, in that we transcribed them not, we rather spared *you* then advantaged *our selves*; for there is something in all of them, that is either doubtfull or justly liable to exceptions.

For you (undertaking to shew the differences betweene the Apostolicke Churches and ours) say:

1. *The Jewish Ceremonies were then scarce dead, at least not buried, hence we are not bound to circumcise.*

*we answer*, This Legall right of *Circumcision* was never on foot among the Apostolick gentile Churches, nor were they bound any more to it then we are now, therefore there is no difference in that, betwixt us and the primitive Apostolicke gentile Churches.

2. *The civill custome of those Countries differ much from ours, hence we are not bound to make the covering of a mans head a token of dishonour, 1 Cor. II. 4, 5. 7. 10.*

*Answer.* What ever it be that the *Apostle* meaneth by covering of the head, (for that is disputable) it seemeth to us to be perpetuall and binding to all Churches as well as to that of Corinth, because of the Apostles reasons in 1 Cor. II. 7. 14. He saith ver. 7. *The man ought not to cover the head, because he is the Image and glory of God, but the woman must, because she is the glory of the man.* And ver. 14. he saith, *Nature it selfe teacheth, that if a man have long haire, it is a shame to him, because haire is not given to him for a covering.* (For so it is to be understood to make the *Antithesis* perfect) But if a woman have long haire, it is an honour to her, because her beire is given her for a covering. We think the reason is fetcht from the excellency of the one sexe above the other, and that reason which is drawne from nature, are perpetuall, And if ever in force, remaine still in force.

3. *The Church was then, but in gathering from amongst Heathens and Jewes, hence we want examples (to convince refractory Anabaptists) of the baptizing of Christian Infants, &c.*

*Ans.* Such an argument as this, you use to defend your selves,

selves, in pleading for an *Nationall Church*, Scripture (say you) mentioneth not a *Nationall Church*; for beleevvers were not so many then, as to beare the name of a Kingdome or Nation. As we conceived it weake against us, so may the Anabaptists judge it unsatisfactory against them. For can any one rationally thinke, but that among those many *thousands* converted of Jewes and Heathens, and gathered into Christian Churches, there were not many who had Infant Children, some of them borne before they were converted, who upon such conversion of their parents were to be accounted Christian Infants, and others borne after such conversion in that period of time, which the history of the A&S of the Apostles fills up, which Infants must also be stiled *Christian Infants*? And if so, then the reason of wanting examples of baptizing Christian Infants is not that which you alledge, viz. because the Church was then but in gathering from amongst the *Heathens* and *Jewes*; But because it seemed good to the Holy Ghost (for what cause we dare not determine) to forbear the expresse mentioning of Infants baptisme.

4. The Church was then under heathenish persecuting Magistrates, hence they had no houses built for or appropriated to holy worship.

Ans. In your *Examinations* pag. 6. you cite, 1 Cor. 11. 22. and say, To come together *ω τῇ τῶν οἰκῶν* is, (if rightly translated) to come together in one place, and so Ecclesia is opposed to the buildings or houses in which they did eate and drinke in: Here you say, That the primitive Churches had not houses, &c. Doe you not manifestly contradict your selfe? for if they were not houses, in which they did eate and drinke in, but did meete together in for holy worship, were they not so farre forth set a part for holy worship?

If by appropriation of houses to holy worship (which you say was not then in the primitive times, but ought to be now) you meane such a setting a part as must necessarily exclude all using of such houses to other purposes, it is  
superstition.

*superstition* so to conceive or speake. But if you grant that use may be made of them otherwise then in Gods worship, How are they then *appropriated* to Gods worship more now then in the times of primitive Churches? For they were then knowne noted places, (at least among some Churches) and capacious of great multitudes, in which the Churches did ordinarily meete, as from 1 Cor. 14. 23. appeares.

*They meete in the night to pray, preach and celebrate the Supper.*

1 Cor. 14.  
23.

*Ans.* And did they not meet in the day also? How else did the unbelievers meet with them & come among them?

*Ministers had no settled maintenance.*

*Ans.* It is a *non sequitur*, that because the Church was under *Heathenish* and persecuting Magistrates, therefore Ministers had no settled maintenance. Is there any rule for settled maintenance in the whole Gospell? which yet (being that there are predictions many, of peaceable and prosperous times to the Church) there might have beene, if God had meant any such thing. Nay, there are intimations, (if not cleare declarations) against settled maintenance to arise from the Churches.

*There was then an extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, Evangelists, and sundry of the Elders and people; hence there was no neede of Universities, &c.*

*Ans.* Yes: there was neede, because you speake but of sundry, and the Apostle desired that they all might speake *with tongues*, but rather that they might *prophesie*, 1 Cor. 14. 5. therefore there might be use of schooles in reference to them that wanted extraordinary gifts.

*Nor of studying for Sermons.*

*Ans.* Yes: Else what meaneth the Apostle when he bids *Timothy stirre up the gift, &c.* and give attendance to reading, &c.

*Not using set Prayers and Psalmes.*

*Ans.* Were there no set Psalmes in those dayes? were those

those Psalmes, Hymmes, and spirituall songs, which the Church at *Ephesus*, and at *Colosse*, and all the Churches did sing inspired by the spirit? And were no scripture Psalmes sung in those times? That will be a strengthening to them that doubt of the singing of *Dauids Psalmes*. As for prayers, is there a necessity now of a Forme, because extraordinary gifts are ceased? May not an ordinary gift be sufficiently helpfull, to put up prayers by? We would thinke it should now be unseasonable to plead for set formes of prayer.

6. *The Apostles had the care of all the Churches, and without difference taught and baptized, and ordered matters in all Churches where they came, now we may not expect such Officers, but must be content with ordinary Elders, amongst whom so much of their power as God intended to be perpetuall, is divided.*

*Ans.* But if there be an universall visible governing Church which you plead for, the Elders of it must have care of all the Churches, and must Preach, Baptize, and rule where ever they come. And the representative œcumenicall Church or Counsell consists of such Elders that every of them must have care of all the Churches. Where then is the difference according to your principles betwixt the Apostles and such Elders in that matter? And whether the Brethren do not share in some of their power you know is under controversie.

7. *There were then some extraordinary occasionall precepts, and praïses which binde not in ordinary, as selling all to give to the poore, Mat. 19. 21, having all things common, Act. 2. 44, 45. & 4. 32. 34, 35.*

*Ans.* Selling all and giving to the poore, was never a precept nor praïse in the Christian Apostolike Churches, nor doth *Mat. 19. 21.* prove it, whereas you produce it to declare the difference betwixt the Apostolike Churches and ours. The having of all things common, had not any precept for it in the Apostles dayes that we know of, and the praïse

practise was voluntary and not binding, though some did it, they freely did it, and others were not bound to follow, as from *Ab. 5. 4.* appears. Where then is the difference betwixt the Apostolike Churches and *ours*? For were there now like cause, for having all worldly substance *common*, and should God incline the hearts of Christians thereto, it might be lawfull *now* as well as then.

Now (Brother) we have given you an account what wee are able to say to your Seven Particulars, which we pre-termitted before. And whether we did hurt you to helpe our selves by our former silence of them, let the intelligent Reader judge.

The *second instance* is, out of your *Examination* of your *Position* the Sixt, where you say, *a maine passage is omitted without giving any hint or intimation of anything omitted.*

*Answ.* The Printer, or he that copied it out for the Presse, possibly hath omitted an *&c.* will it be worth the roasting what you have taken in *hunting*?

2. We might challenge you if you can, so to <sup>improve</sup> *avoids* the whole, or any part of those six lines omitted, to the releefe or rescue either of the cause or your *Examination*, as they relate unto the *Position*.

For those words wherein you alledge, *Gen. 9. 9, 10.* we looked upon them as free of the Company of those By-matters you besought us in the Preface not to meddle with; which if we had examined, could neither advantage your cause nor indanger ours.

For the rest of the words omitted, they are but different expressions of the same thing imported in the words transcribed and both fully answered.

You say (but it is your mistake) *That the Covenant (Gen. 17) is taken for Gods part of the Covenant or Promise to Abraham, Gal. 3. 16, 17. Not for mans part to God, whereof we now speak, & then adde Gods Covenanting with Abraham did not impose nor suppose an expresse vocall Covenant on Abrahams part.*



part. Now if this be so, then was not *Abraham* bound to any thing on his part by vertue of this Covenant; but the contrary is manifest from *vers. 9.* where God said to *Abraham*, *Thou shalt keepe my Covenant.*

*Ob.* If it be said, *This Covenant was Circumcision.*

*Ans.* Circumcision is called the Covenant Metonymically, as the *Seale* may be called by the name of the thing sealed; and therefore is called the token of the Covenant, *vers. 11.*

*Ob.* If it be said, *this was not an expresse vocall Covenant.*

*Ans.* The *Position* mentioneth an holy Covenant, but saith nothing of an expresse vocall Covenant; and you by your bringing in these words do alter the Question; nor doe we hold an expresse vocall Covenant necessary to the being of a Church. And we would be rightly understood, when we say it is necessary to the purity and strength of a Church. Our meaning is not, that it is a standing Ordinance of God, that the Church should be united by a *vocall expression* of their mutuall consent (which we call the *Covenant*) so as that *subscription, signalls, or silence* it selfe, as a *signe*, may not be a lawfull testification of their consent: but that for as much as with the heart man beleeueth to righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation; for as much as God hath given us our *tongues* to expresse our conceptions withall, it is fit and convenient, that it should be expressed in words, and so words are necessary, as one (and usually the fittest) expression of our mindes.

Lastly, having proved, that the stipulation 'twixt *God* and *Abraham* was mutuall, you are rather our debtor than we yours; for passing by your expressions concerning *Gen. 9. 9, 10.* as expletive to fill up your sentence upon a just period, rather than argumentative, for would it not be an intolerable inconsequence thus to argue.

If Gods covenanting with a creature doth not alway suppose so much as an implicite covenant on the creatures

part, then Gods covenanting with *Abraham*, *Gen. 17.* doth not suppose an expresse vocall Covenant on *Abrahams* part; (take it at the best as you have stated it for your advantage, quite besides the question.)

But the first is true, *Gen. 9. 9, 10. Ergo &c.* For what hinders though it doth <sup>not</sup> alwayes doe it, why it may not doe it, *Gen. 17.* Besides the Assumption may be called in question in point of truth. If you speake of a Covenant, as properly so called: For whereas you urge that the birdes and beasts could not so much as give an implicite assent, we say it is true: but say withall that it was not a Covenant in propriety of speech with them, but improperly, even as the Covenant mentioned, *Job 3. 23. Hos. 2. 18.* And we say with Master *Rivet*, *In fœderis objectis quæri potest, an animalia sunt fœderis capacia, quæ neque stipulari possunt, neque promittere, ex superioribus id repetendum quemadmodum indirecte, &c.* In the object of the Covenant it may be enquired how living creatures can be capable of the Covenant, which can neither stipulate nor promise. Therefore we must repeate what we have said before, that as the living creatures became sharers of the punishment of sinne, indirectly and for mans sake, so the benefit of the Covenant concerning the not sending of another flood doth indirectly and for mans sake, belong unto them. So for children not borne, it was not a <sup>not</sup> actual Covenant, but onely vertuall and potentiall, to the reduction of which into an actually mutuall Covenant, (which is a Covenant properly so called) was required the stipulation of the Children, when they should be actually called, to take hold of Gods Covenant.

But this Covenant as it related to *Noah*, did suppose a Covenant on *Noahs* part. For he was bound to faith, and walking with God on his part, as well as God to preserve him and the world from a flood. For as Master *Rivet* saith upon another occasion; *Fiunt autem fœdera mutua stipulatione partium, &c.* Covenants are made with a mutuall and solemne

*Rivet in  
Gen 9.*

lemne stipulation, of engaging themselves to the performance of such and such benefits and duties. Here we reade of the promises of a mercy on Gods part, but there is no mention of the duties that Noah for his part was to performe, but yet this must be understood that Noah would walke justly and uprightly as he had done in former times. So *Paræus* upon this place calls it, *mutuum fœdus*, a mutuall covenant. So that if it be understood of a Covenant properly so called, and homogeneous with that in *Gen. 17.* (and if it be not, the argument will be of no force) it may be said that Gods covenanting with man, doth suppose a restipulation or covenant on mans part.

The third instance is out of position 7. where also you would have the Reader to understand; that the chiefe part of your answer, viz. *It is not said they gave themselves to the Church or Churches, but to us, viz. Paul and Timothy, is left without the least hint or intimation.*

*Answ.* Are not these words to be found in our defence? pag. 44. The argument is fetcht a Comparatis, the members of the Churches of Macedonia did as much in a like case: they gave themselves to the Lord, and to the Apostle and Timothy, according to Gods will, to be guided by the Lord, and directed by them, a whole Church or Churches to one or two persons gave themselves; And an argument is fetcht thence thus, then may one person that is to joine to a Church, as fitly give himselfe to the Lord to be guided by him, and to the whole Church and Officers thereof to be directed by them according to the will of God. Doe not we grant, that it is not said, that they gave themselves to the Church or Churches, but to us, viz. Paul and Timothy? Nor doth the Position imply any other thing. For it saith, *As the members of the Church of Macedonia did in a parallell or like case.* It speakes onely of something done proportionably to that which they presse: where then is the injury done to you? Is it in this, that without mentioning your allegation, as your allegation, we have yet answered

the whole strength of it? Forgive us this wrong, and retract your charge, which though it have truth in it, in the letter of your words in which it runs, yet it wants truth in your scope in which you make it; For you complaine of *wrong* to you and the truth of God, but causelessly and most injuriously, as from what is presented is manifest.

The fourth instance is out of *Position 22*, where you say, your whole answer to Revel. 4.4. is by an *Index expurgatorius* blotted out.

*Ans.* We have sought up our papers, and we perceive that in the copying out of the *Reply* for the presse, the answer to this text was omitted, *Casu an Consilio*, we cannot say. The answer was to this effect, it hath been usually the practise of men of the most approved parts, and unquestioned integrity, after they have solidly proved a place by plaine texts of scripture, then to adde as probable those which in their judgement lookt that way, though more obscure, as typicall and prophetical places; The same is that practise of the Elders of *New England*, in urging this place. So that if you could make it out, that the Elders have mist the genuine sense of the place, yet you have but knockt off one of the *Emblemata* of the garnishings of the roome, whereas the *Position* it selfe remains unshaken by you.

2. We doe professe our selves unwilling to defend the *position* by vertue of the text (at least in that expression, viz. *of authority and governing power*) yet it may be those reverend learned and religious Authors are able to maintaine it, though we by reason of our weakenesse dare not undertake it.

3. As for the exposition that you put upon it, though it be consonant to the interpretation of some learned writers, and though it seemed probable to one of us, yet upon further inspection, though we absolutely reject it, yet we have not yet these exceptions against it.

I. We

1. We read not of any eyes that the 24 Elders had; but the four beasts were full of eyes, *Rev. 4. 8.* Is this the meaning of it, that the Churches in the four Quarters of the world had eyes, that is, wisdom, knowledge, understanding to manage, order, guide, and dispose of the affaires of the Churches: But the Officers wanted eyes, and so were excluded from directive power? For this will follow upon your exposition, at least, if your argument against the interpretation which the Elders of New England give of *Crownes*, prove solid. You say by their exposition, *The Elders which are signified by the four beasts, are excluded from governing power, for they sit not on Thrones, nor have Crownes on their heads.* And we will say against you, the Elders which you would have to be the Elders of the Churches are excluded from directive power, for they have not eyes before and behinde, as the four beasts have.

2. We read that the four beasts doe lead the four and twenty Elders in the worship and Service of God in the Church, *Revel. 4. 9, 10.* When those Beasts gave honour and glory, &c. the four and twenty Elders fell downe and worshipped, &c. So also *c. 5. 8. 11. 14.* Now whether the Churches doe lead their Officers in all their worships they performe to God, (which will follow from your exposition) or the Officers doe lead the Churches, judge you.

3. We see no absurdity in Masters Cottons and New-Englands brethrens exposition, who make the four beasts to be the Officers of the Churches, and the four and twenty Elders to be the members. As for your allegation of *Revel. 7. 9. 11. 13, 14.* where you say, *That the Elders are distinguished from beleivers;* We answer to it, We discern not that the Elders are any more distinguished then the four beasts are, which yet you interpret to be the Beleivers of the four parts of the world, let the place be viewed.

4. Though Master Cotton deliv, that by *Crownes*, are Ensignes of authority any more then white rayment was an Ensigne.

*Cott. Calc.* Ensigne of Priesthood, yet he asserts, that in some particulars that belongs to Church members, which is the Priviledge of Kings that weare Crownes: As 1. *That they transact nothing by themselves, but by their Officers.* 2. *Their consent is requisite to the judgements that passe in the Church.* And therefore it may seeme lesse strange, if they appeare with Crownes.

Having thus answered that part of your Epistle, wherein you lay divers charges upon us, we shall now more briefly answer the former part of your Epistle, wherein you endeavour to purge your selfe from those charges laid upon you. And you say,

*The deepe and heavy charge (as you call it) in the first part of my preface against misinterpretation of scriptures, as a beying of God, counterfeiting the King of Kings hand, (though I now see how I have sped) I repent not of.*

*Psal. 35.  
11.*

*Ans.* Neither appeares it that you doe repent, that you have position 23 laid to our charge things that we knew not, yea things, that when we heard of them, were of despicable consideration in our thoughts. If you shall solidly confute our reply, we shall justifie you in this impenitency, but if otherwise, we shall desire to mourne in secret for you, and pray, that God would give it an impression upon your spirit.

You have the more cause to repent, if that be true which you alledge in the portall of your Epistle, viz. *that the Examination &c. was for the most part an answer to some allegations, as they were privately made to you for satisfaction.* For doe doubting brethren wanting light addresse themselves to you for satisfaction concerning the meaning of such and such scriptures; and doe you publish their doubts, as their positions, and what was proposed to you privately to obtaine satisfaction, doe you divulge it to the world: as a beying of God, a counterfeiting of the King of Kings hand, an addition to his word? Surely this will make men tender how they seeke satisfaction from you for the future.

*Nor*



Nor see I cause (say you) why you should repine at it, or complaine of it: if you have clearly manifested (as in your title page you say you have) the positions and scriptures alledged for your Church way, and by me examined, to be sufficient, pertinent, and full of power.

Doth not the meaning of this amount to thus much? (For undoubtedly these censures relate to the positions, and consequently to the authors of them) that if an interpretation may be clearly manifested to be sufficient, pertinent, and full of power, then the persons that give it, may not complaine; though they be all bedawbed with imputations of belying God, counterfeiting the King of Kings hand, adding to the word? Must innocency of necessity be stupid and infensible of injuries?

*Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas.*

And yet I find my selfe deeply charged by you to deprave places, blotte and blurre sweet, humble, spirited, holy, pertinent Expressions, to wrong the Elders of New-England, wrest allegations.

Ans. Let the Reader judge betwixt us, if it be not truth. But you goe on and say,

Yea though I said, I will not tell you who said all the Church is holy, &c: yet you thinke it not unworthy my serious consideration, whether it might not be said to mee, as sometimes Christ said to one of the twelve, when he asked, Master is it I? and he answered, thou hast said: (a bitter personall invective) &c.

We intended not these words as any invective at all, much lesse as a personall invective as you affirme; It was never an Embrio in our thoughts to compare you with Judas (as you insinuate) 'tis cleare as the Sun, that you compare the Congregationall members in the pursuit of their way, to Corah, Dathan, and Abiram. Our meaning is plainly this, by this forme of speaking, borrowed from our Saviours words in another case, to signifie that it might rather be said against you, what you bring against us, viz. That Presbyteriall governours doe take too much upon them, because they take

take upon them, an authoritative power over those Congregations over whom Christ hath not set them. Your reasons to prove that our way is the *gainsaying* of *Corah* are weak: For 1. this *schismaticall* company would utterly have taken away the power of *Moses* and the Priesthood of *Aaron*, and so when they had *Officers*, would have destroyed their *Officers*: we onely in the extraordinary case of an utter want of an *Eldership* to ordaine, hold it fit to ordaine by persons deputed, or by Elders elected; If in the constitution of a Church, there doe joyne as members, severall persons that have beene approved Ministers, whilst their relations to their severall Churches were in being, then some of these are deputed to ordaine the *first Elder*; If there be but one Preacher joyned as a member, and severall persons of eminent holinesse and gifts, fitted for *ruling Elders*, then there is an *Eldership* chosen, and the rest of the *Eldership* ordained *one* of their Company for their *first Elder*. In the Church of *Duckenfield* in *Cheshire*, four Preachers joyned in the foundation of the Church. At *Sourby* in *Yorkshire* but one; But in both places the Ordination was performed either by Preachers as deputed, or by elect Elders.

2. If the placing of Church power in the body of the Congregation, were the *gainsaying* of *Corah*, then because election of Officers (*AB. 6.*) is a branch of Church-power, and was placed in, and acted by the body of the Church at *Jerusalem*, that Church was guilty of the *gaine-saying* of *Corah*, which is your second Argument.

3. 'Tis not true, that our cause enjoynes or allowes complaining (*i.e.* of the regular exercise of the power) of the Elders that rule over them in the Lord, for taking too much upon them, but we honour and obey the *Elderships* of our severall Churches; and also the Elders and Members deputed of severall Churches met in a Synod occasionally to rectifie disorders, &c. which the particular Churches  
are

are not able to accomplish. But as for *stated* *Classicall* *Elderships*, and your severall *graduall* *Juicatures*, swallowing up the *Votes* of the *Elders* of the particular Congregation in the Major part of the *Votes* of the *Synod*, Ordaining, Depri-  
ving, Admonishing, Excommunicating, Restoring; we say, these are not powers ordained of God. And consequently we are not guilty of the gaine-saying of *Corah*, though wee should say of these, *They take too much upon them*.

You proceed, *The usuall occasion of your Censures of depraving places, &c. is a wide (I hope) not a willing mistake in you, and not any iniquity in my hands or heart, you expect the Positions and Scriptures alledged, to agree fully and exactly with the places cited in the Margent, which I neither professed nor intended, &c.*

*Ans.* We expect not an exact agreement in words and expressions, but yet we could not but looke for an agreement according to the expressions of your Marginalls in sense and importment. Where you say *Position*. See almost the same *Argument verbatim*. We expect with good cause an exact agreement in sense and almost in words. When you say, *See the like*, we expect there an exact agreement in sense, and a likenesse in manner of expression, and so in the rest. For if there be not the same thing asserted in both, the Margent is ridiculous. In divers *Positions* your Marginalls have no such modifications in them, must we not expect an exact agreement in sense and words in those places?

Your *Marginalls* themselves are *profession* enough of such an agreement, especiall to any man that readeth your Preface, where you say, *The way of Independencie produceth sundry texts in Preaching, Writing, Conference, which for the most part also, she produceth in Print upon the same or the like occasion*.

Doth not this import an agreement in sense and importment, betwixt the *Printed Bookes* alledged and the *Positions* gathered from *Preaching, Writing, Conference*?

F

When

When you say, *You alledge Printed Bookes probably to intimate whence the Proposition was taken*: Do you not imply that the substance of the Proposition is to be found in the place from whence it is taken, and if it be not found there, are you not justly to be blamed?

Whereas you say *The Printed Bookes alledged in the Margent are the By-standers spoken of in the Preface*, either we doe much mistake you, or you doe, (which were strange) not a little mistake your selfe. What then is the meaning of these words in the Preface? *I publish not all their Depositions, nor all that is materiall, but so much (as I conceive) at present sufficient. If any of the Brethren (amongst whom Mr. Cotton is deservedly the chiefe) seeme in my apprehension to come neerer the truth then others, I willingly take notice of it, &c.*

Is not Mr. Cotton one among the rest of those Authors in Print, whose Depositions you publish, how then is Mr. Cotton and the rest made By-standers which must not be meddled with? And (by the way) if you had any action at all to enter against the cause, vvhy did you so uningenuously as not to publish all that is *materiall*? Is it your meaning that you would have liberty to alledge our Printed Bookes at your pleasure, and we might not take notice whether you did them right or wrong? This seemeth to be too grosse. For our parts we tooke By-standers and By-matters to be meant of some expressions rather of an *ornative* and *expletive* then of an *argumentative* nature.

The next thing you iadeavour to purge your selfe from, is from *affecting Prelacy*, which you say, we doe secretly intimate; and that to this end; to cast an *odium* upon you and the cause you plead.

*Ans.* We know you are more wise then to expresse affection to declining *Prelacie*. If you should, this could not with rationall men, bring an *Odium* upon your Cause: and when you say, *peradventure the word (simply) was put in for a retreat*, in cause you should be hotly pursued for pleading the Cause  
of

of Prelacie under the notion of Presbytery; we intended to shew the weaknesse of your reasoning, not to cast an *Odium* upon you, for the thing it selfe avoid the force of it if you can. If (you say) *Diotrephes* was not blamed for having prebeminence. Doe you not plead the Prelaticall Cause? And if you say, he was not simply blamed, Doe you not cleare the Allegation of the Elders? If there be any other place mention it, and we hope to give you satisfaction.

But you say, *That you in the worst times were not more Prelaticall then the greatest and godliest Independents in the Kingdome, if not at least one of us have beene.*

*Ans.* For our selves, when we first entred into the Ministry, we were both of us conformable in judgement, and sometimes (though very rarely) in practise. But we have bewailed, and publicly testified our repentance, both before and since the times of this present Parliament. The one of us renounced it, and was therefore suspended by the Bishop of Chester fourteene yeares agoe, and was afterwards about thirteene yeares since expelled from his habitation, and after that about eleven yeares since was forced to leave the Kingdome, and to seeke for shelter in *Holland*, and there joyned with others in a Congregationall way, and after that when the unsutableness of that aire occasioned much sicknesse, he was constrained to returne, and finding no rest was the second time necessitated to transplant himselfe into *New-England*, where if the High Commission at *Torke* could have let him alone, he might probably have ended his dayes; But for none appearance at their Courts, when yet he was out of the Land, and knew nothing of their summons, he was fined in severall summes of money, which together amounted to fiftene hundred and fifty pound. And his estate in *Wirrall* in *Cheshire* was extended upon for payment, and the Tenant to whom the Land was leased before his departure to *New-England*, forced to pay great summes of money for the redemption of his cattell, which were driven



off the ground: where he was supported in those troublous times by the beneficence of two religious Gentlemen, viz. Master *William Stevinson* of *Dorset*, and his sonne in law *Creswal Taylor* of *Longdon* aforesaid his noble friends. And the tidings of these cruell proceedings, and the greivous complaints of the Tenant, comming over to him in severall letters, he was advised to try if by his returning backe, he could use meanes to free his estate, but before he arrived this renowned reforming Parliament was assembled, and what he hath suffered since for his opposition to Prelacy is known not to a few.

As for the other of us, some yeares before the Bishops fell, and whilst their power seemed to be bound as with a Band of iron and brasse, being enforced by the then Chancellour of *Hereford*, to turne his afternoone Sermon into a Catechisme Lecture. Upon that occasion studying more elaborately and industriously the second Commandment, through the rich grace and mercy of God not onely saw the evill of *Episcopacy*, and ceremonies imposed, but also repented of the use of them, and publicly in the Parish of *Almele* in *Herefordshire* preached against them, and for all the substantialls of that way of Congregationall government, which ever since, and at this day, he hath and doth judge to beare most conformity with the word of truth. Afterward being troubled in the Bishops Court for Non-conformity, and having no hope of liberty, did by consent leave *Almele*, and lived about three yeares in a small peculiar exempt from Episcopall Jurisdiction, viz. *Longdon* upon *Terene* in *Shropshire*. And yet we suppose there may be other Independents (so called) more anti-prelaticall then our selves. Concerning you, though you have forced us by your causelesse comparison, (which also was a manifest charge) to appeare in our owne justification, yet (that being done) we are not willing to vent our selves in the words of detraction against you, but we leave you to your owne conscience.

Read y<sup>e</sup> second  
time in this  
place after  
the morning  
Shropshire

conscience to be judged; and to the judgement of some thousands of persons, who have many yeares been acquainted with your whole course of preaching and living, whether the *comparison* was equall.

You say, *You plead for the government of the Reformed Churches maintained by Master Burne of Manchester, Master Gosnall of Boulton, Master Fleetwood of Wigan, &c.*

*Answ.* What these Reverend men did hold or maintaine, we have no particular knowledge, saving that we thinke good to let you understand, that Reverend Master Burne was in his latter dayes, in a great part against that *Classicall* way which you contend for. And we have notes of his *owne* hand writing, which we can if need require (and hereafter it may be shall) produce, to the open view of men. In which he closeth very much with the Brethren of *N. England* in their answer to the nine *Positions*, and dislikes Mr. *Bals* Reply.

Thus Brother, we have endeavoured to take off the strength of your complaints, which you make against us in your Epistle. Our hearts doe witnesse for us that we intended not to use guile or cunning craftinesse in our defence of the *Positions* and *Scriptures* against your examinations, nor yet to asperse you with reproaches, but with integrity of spirit, what we have beleev'd with the heart, we attempted the maintenance of without any designe of wronging you, much lesse the truth of God. We hope your ingenuity will be such that you will retract so hard a censure, and repent of such a causelesse out-cry, with which you close your Epistle. If not, let the godly intelligent Reader judge betwixt us, whether we or the Complainant hath most offended; as for us it shall be our desire that peace & truth may abound more and more with you, and with

Your loving Brethren

Sam. Eaton.

Tim. Taylor.

Concerning your questions, whereto you require rationall and scripturall answers, you have beene so insatiable in the multiplication of them, as that you have made your demand irrationall to rationall men. If seven or eight questions may well exercise an Assembly of men some weekes, perhaps monthes, to give scripturall and rationall answers to them, how long may one or two be exercised in answering one hundred and twelve questions?

Yet we shall say somewhat to them, and give our sense of them, the better to be excused with the Reader, though we give not at present a direct scripturall answer to any of them.

1. Your questions are reducible to these heads. Some of them are either in whole or in part answered already, in our defence, as Q. 11. 24. 30, 31. 35, 36. 38. 41, 42, 43. 48, 49. 52. 56. 73. 77, 78. 84, 85. 102, 103.

2. Some of them are bottomed upon mistakes, of things asserted to be held by us, which yet we hold not, as 19, 20, 21, 22. 39. 44. 50, 51. 56, 57, 58. 61. 80.

3. Some of them do arise and proceed *ex non concessis*, from things taken for granted, which yet we cannot grant, as 23. 29. 32. 84.

4. Some of them are *de non negatis*, of things which we grant and yeeld as well as you, wherein you and we doe agree, or else they are *de negatis*, of things which both you and we do alike deny, as 55. 86, 87. 91. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100. 102, 103.

5. Some of them are in the nature of them deep censures, & full of calumny & slander, both of our way & persons, as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. 10. 15. 37. 41. 45. 49. 57. 78. 83. 88. 104. 107.

6. Some of them savour of a bitter distempered spirit, and tend to incense the Magistrate against us, as 57. 96. 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112.

7. Some of them seeme to be <sup>Envious</sup> *dubious* questions proceeding from a troubled spirit, that either we have Auditors to heare us preach or any maintenance from any beside them of our owne way, as 77. 79. 84.

8. Some

8. Some of them are entrapping questions, and in them there is *aliquid latens* some thing that appeares not and you watch for advantage, as 76. 81. 82.

9. One of them (in a superfluous Parenthesis) gibes at the language of many godly knowne Christians, who yet are able to justifie their expressions, viz. 46.

10. One of them is a question concluding with a vaine-glorious chalenge. viz. 100.

11. Some of them are such as that many of the Brethren of the Presbyterian judgement doe agree with us in them, and we may referre you to them to answer them, as 46. 71.

12. One of them is rather a point controverted among your selves then betwixt you and us, viz. 90.

13. Some of them are impertinent and come not up to the controversie betwixt us, as 16. 17. 18. 44. 54. and some others.

14. Some of them are unnecessary questions, because the answering of some one, would cut off and make voide the necessitie of propounding and answering of the rest of that nature, as the answering of the 7. would prevent the propounding of the 8. 10. 13. 14. the answering of the 11. would make the 9. and 12. uselesse. So the answering of 63. makes vaine the propounding of 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 64. 65. 66. 68. and so of others.

15. The most of them are argumentative, and do dispute against the thing, and sometimes conclude peremptory, rather then propound and inquire after the thing of which yet in forme of words there is a question made.

By all which it appeares how many of this great multitude of Questions might have beene spared, and how little reason we have to answer them.

Had you not done more commendably if you had propounded some one Question of a kind; as namely, one about constitution of Churches; one about gathering out of many Churches, one about the qualification of Members; one about an universall visible governing Church; one about diversity

*The Congregational way JUSTIFIED.*

diversity of Congregations in those City Churches mentioned in Scripture; one about the entity and power of an incompleate Church that hath no Officers; one about the Covenant, and of what Covenant Baptisme is the seale; one about the power of the Keyes; one about Ordination; one about Communion of Officers; one about maintenance of Officers; one about a private mans exercising his gifts; one about withdrawing from communion of ones own Church, Ministry, and Ordinances; one about the externalls of discipline, whether they be contained determinately in the New Testament; one about the lawfulnessse of tolerating another way then what is by Law established; and yet it would have beene unreasonable to have propounded some of these till the answers we have given to them already in our Defence, have beene rendred invalid; and all these would not have amounted to above 15. Questions, vvhhat then would have become of your many scores. But your designe was under the forme of sundry Questions, to assault us vvith sundry Arguments, for very many of your Questions, yea the most of them are arguments which if we confute and overthrow (though your greatest strength be put forth in them; yet) you come off with honour, you asserted nothing positively but propounded only Questions; & if we confute them not nor answer them clearly, we receive (as you imagine) a blot thereby; such cunning there is in the vvay of your proceeding. But we rather choose to put you upon it to state the Question vvith us, and then to forme your Argument, and we shall vvillingly ingage our selves then in answering of you, this is to set our selves upon equall ground vvith you; and you cannot, and we hope the Reader will not expect fairer proceedings from us. Notwithstanding if you like not this, vvait but a vvhile, till this present controversie be issued betwixt us, and if others in the interim doe not, we shall probably be at leasure to undertake the particular answer of them in the forme they are presented to us.

**FINIS.**